

REMARKS

Claims 1-19, 21, 23-25, 27 and 28 are pending in the application, with claim 1 being the only independent claim. Claims 1-3, 7-8, 13-19, 21, 23-25, and 27 have been amended herein. Therefore, upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-19, 21, 23-25, 27 and 28 will be subject to examination.

The Claim Objections

Claims 2-3 have been amended to properly spell the word “interfacial.”.

Claims 7-8, 13-19, 21, 23-25 and 27 have been amended to introduce proper dependencies.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 1-12 and 28 have been rejected under 35 USC 102 (e) as anticipated by U.S. Published Application No. 20030178937 to Mishima (“Mishima”).

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim under examination. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). See also MPEP 2131.02

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, that “said metal layer or said metal foil is disposed such that light generated as a result of said electroluminescence directed towards said metal layer or said metal foil is reflected back to said at least semi-transparent upper electrode layer for enhancing light output from the flexible organic light-emitting device.”

It is believed that at least the above limitation of amended claim 1 is not taught or suggested in Mishima.

Mishima teaches a light-emitting device that comprises an anode, one or more organic compound layers containing at least a light-emitting layer, and a transparent cathode on a flexible support substrate having gas barrier properties, the flexible support substrate having a

linear thermal expansion coefficient of 20 ppm/ °C. or less. See Mishima, Summary of the Invention.

More particularly, the disclosure in Mishima is clearly limited to a light-emitting device in which the flexible support substrate plays no role whatsoever in the light-emitting characteristics of the described structure. The Examiner is directed in particular to the description in paragraphs [0020] - [0030] of Mishima, which contain the disclosure of the flexible support substrate in Mishima. Applicants have been unable to identify any disclosure or suggestion of utilizing the metal foil moisture and oxygen barrier such that light generated as a result of electroluminescence in the light-emitting device is reflected back to an at least semi-transparent upper electrode layer for enhancing light output, as defined in Applicants' amended claim 1.

Moreover, Mishima specifically teaches in paragraph [0036] that “[b]ecause the emitted light is taken out from a transparent cathode in the light-emitting device of the present invention, the anode may be colorless transparent, colored transparent or opaque.” Applicants submit that to a person skilled in the art, considering this disclosure without hindsight deriving from the present invention, this teaching further emphasizes that the only “light enhancement” disclosed in Mishima relates to the transparent cathode and to ways of improving the transparency of the transparent cathode. See, e.g. paragraphs [0065] - [0073] of Mishima. Contrary to that, exemplary embodiments of the present invention can be implemented with semi-transparent upper electrodes, as defined in amended claim 1 and still provide an enhanced light output, since light initially reflected from the semi-transparent upper electrode can be reflected back to the upper electrode and to enhance light output from the flexible organic light-emitting device, as recited in amended claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from Mishima. Claims 2-19, 21, 23-25, 27 and 28 are patentably distinguishable from Mishima at least for the same reasons as claim 1. The amendments to claims 2, 3, and 13 have been introduced to more define the claimed invention with greater clarity. No new matter has been added.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 13, 15-19, 21, 23-25 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Mishima. Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Mishima in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,972,431 to Forrest (“Forrest”). Claim 27 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Mishima in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,932,965 to Berggren (“Berggren”).

To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). See also MPEP 2131.03.

Mishima has been discussed above. With regard to claims 13, 15-19, 21, 23-25 and 27, the Examiner has argued that Mishima suggests the use of an index matching layer as claimed in claim 13, and also that Mishima teaches the additional limitations of claims 15-19, 21, 23-25 and 27. Even if Mishima taught or suggested these additional limitations (which Applicants are not conceding), Mishima still does not disclose that “said metal layer or said metal foil is disposed such that light generated as a result of said electroluminescence directed towards said metal layer or said metal foil is reflected back to said at least semi-transparent upper electrode layer for enhancing light output from the flexible organic light-emitting device.” Because this missing limitation is included in each of claims 13, 15-19, 21, 23-25 and 27, these claims are all patentably distinguishable from Mishima.

With regard to claims 14 and 27, the Examiner has argued that Forrest teaches an index-matching layer that includes an organic material having a refractive index for enhancing light output, and that Berggren teaches an electron injection layer that is comprised of a calcium and lithium sub-layer structure. Even if Forrest and Berggren taught or suggested these additional limitations (which Applicants are not conceding), the combination of Mishima with Forrest or Berggren still does not disclose that “said metal layer or said metal foil is disposed such that light generated as a result of said electroluminescence directed towards said metal layer or said metal foil is reflected back to said at least semi-transparent upper electrode layer for enhancing light output from the flexible organic light-emitting device.” Because this missing limitation is

included both in claims 14 and 27, both of these claims are all patentably distinguishable from Mishima.


Therefore, the withdrawal of all rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

It is believed that all objections and rejections have been fully addressed, and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Dated: February 12, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



Mitchell P. Brook
Registration No. 32,967
Attorney for Applicants

LUCE, FORWARD, HAMILTON & SCRIPPS LLP
11988 El Camino Real, Suite 200
San Diego, California 92130
Tel: (858) 720-6300
Fax: (858) 720-6306

701015454.1